

REMARKS

Presently, claims 1-44 are pending in the application.

Prior Art Rejections - § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 13, 29, 31, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0167503 A1 to Tsunoda *et al.* ("Tsunoda"). The Examiner contends that Tsunoda discloses selecting and enlarging a child picture and displaying it adjacent to unselected pictures which do not contain any image data of the enlarged picture. The Examiner thus concludes that Tsunoda anticipates independent claim 1 of the present invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Tsunoda discloses a method and apparatus for displaying multiple video sources by changing them between a main picture and a child picture. Furthermore, Tsunoda's invention includes a visible transition, such that the user may easily determine when a picture in the picture display has changed position between a main and child picture. Tsunoda includes a synthesization unit 9 which synthesizes two or more sets of input video data for output to the display device 11. Tsunoda's system is capable of displaying up to four independent program video sources output from the synthesization unit 9 in a layout according to a predetermined priority. Fig. 4 of Tsunoda shows an example of a picture layout which is set to display one main picture and two child pictures simultaneously. Although there are four video input sources, but only three display pictures, the display priority of each video source determines which three of the four video input sources are visibly displayed on the display unit 11. The user has the opportunity to select one of the child pictures or the main picture to instantaneously change the size (i.e., enlarge or reduce) of the respective picture. In one example, the display device 11 initially has two images superimposed over each other at the child picture 1, a single image at child picture 2 and a third image at the main picture display. If a user selects to enlarge, for example, the child picture 1, one of the images at this position is moved to the main display and, depending on the priority of the selected image, is superimposed over the existing main picture image (see Fig. 6C). The resulting set of images in the display device 11 thus includes an

enlarged image in the main picture display or the original child picture 1, a new image in child picture 1 (i.e., the lower priority image of the original superimposed image in original child picture 1) and the same image in child picture 2. Similarly, Tsunoda discloses that reducing an image in the main picture window to one of the child images operates in the same manner, whereby the reduced image is superimposed, according to priority, on the selected child picture.

For a rejection under § 102(e) to be proper, a reference must disclose, either explicitly or inherently, each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Tsunoda does not teach each and every element recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 1 recites:

A method of enlarging a digital image displayed in a graphical user interface (GUI), the method comprising:

- (a) selecting for enlargement a portion of an original image displayed in the GUI; and
- (b) displaying, adjacent to an enlarged image of the selected portion, an image of the remaining portion of the original image that was not selected for enlargement, wherein the remaining portion does not include image data displayed by the enlarged image.

Tsunoda does not disclose "displaying . . . an image of the remaining portion of the original image that was not selected for enlargement . . ." In Applicants' invention of claim 1, a user selects a portion of an original image displayed in the GUI (see Fig. 6 of the present application). In a subsequent step, Applicants' invention displays an image of the remaining portion "that was not selected for enlargement" (see, for example, Fig. 7 of the present application). Thus, Applicants' system enlarges the selected portion of the original image and also continues to display any and all portions of the original image which were not selected by the user. The remaining portion of the original is displayed adjacent to the enlarged image, albeit possibly in a different configuration. In contrast, Tsunoda discloses a system which displays only part of the remaining portion of the original image. In Tsunoda the image which is being enlarged or reduced "moves" from one picture location to another, thereby leaving a void in the location from which it came. Thus, either an image over which the selected image was superimposed is now visible (i.e., Figs. 6A-6C of Tsunoda), or the display space from which the selected image came is left blank if there was not an image originally superimposed under it (see

Figs. 7A-7C of Tsunoda). In either case, the complete visible display shown on the display device 11 subsequent to the enlargement or reduction action disclosed by Tsunoda does not contain "the remaining portion of the original image that was not selected for enlargement." Because Tsunoda's system shows a transitioned image display based upon the priority of the individual images output by the synthesization unit 9, Tsunoda's method does not replace an image in the picture space from which the selected image originated. Rather, Tsunoda discloses the superimposition of images upon one another in the display device 11. Accordingly, Tsunoda does not teach each and every element of independent claim 1 as contended by the Examiner.

Dependent claim 13 is allowable at least by its dependency on independent claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 29, as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Tsunoda does not disclose an apparatus which "reconfigures the image data such that the remaining portion is displayed adjacent to an enlarged image of the selected portion." Accordingly, Tsunoda does not teach each and every element of independent claim 29.

With respect to independent claim 31, for similar reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Tsunoda does not disclose "displaying, adjacent to an enlarged image of the selected image portion, the remaining selectable image portions that were not selected." In Tsunoda, one or more of the unselected portions of the original image remains "hidden" under a higher priority image which is superimposed thereon. Accordingly, Tsunoda does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 31.

Dependent claims 35, 38, 39 and 41 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claim 31.

With respect to independent claim 42, for similar reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 31, Tsunoda does not disclose "displaying, adjacent to an enlarged image of the selected portion, at least the selectable image portions that were immediately adjacent to the selected image portion prior to being enlarged." That is, Tsunoda discloses a system where the selected image transitions, or moves, to a different location on the display device 11, where the it is possibly superimposed over another image. Thus, the portion over which the selected image is superimposed cannot be viewed or displayed. Accordingly, Tsunoda does not teach each and every element of independent claim 42.

Dependent claim 44 is allowable at least by its dependency on independent claim 42. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 13, 29, 31, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42 and 44 are respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections - § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5, 14-18 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsunoda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 to Matthews ("Matthews").

For the same reasons discussed above with respect to the Examiner's § 102(e) rejection, Tsunoda does not teach every element of independent claims 1 and 31. Thus, claims 1 and 31 are believed to be allowable over the combination of Tsunoda and Matthews. Accordingly, dependant claims 2-5 and 32-34 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 1 and 31, respectively.

With respect to independent claim 14, Applicants respectfully submit that Tsunoda and Matthews are not properly combinable references. Matthews teaches an interactive entertainment system having a user interface unit. An electronic programming guide ("EPG") within the interface unit allows a user to access more detailed information about programs displayed on the EPG. When a user selected a desired program, supplemental information or data associated with that program is also displayed.

As discussed above, Tsunoda teaches a system which displays images from multiple video sources on a single display device 11. The layout and display of the images (i.e., child pictures and main picture) is based on the pre-determined priority assigned to an individual video source. As the Examiner points out, Tsunoda mentions an EPG. However, Tsunoda only suggests that information from the EPG may be input to the control unit 12 to help control one or more of the video sources. Furthermore, Tsunoda's system does not suggest that such EPG information is shown as an image on the display device 11, and certainly does not suggest that such EPG information allows a user to interactively obtain additional information about one of the displayed pictures. Rather, Tsunoda is directed to the synthesis and display of multiple images or streams from multiple video sources on a single display device, as well as the ability to visually track transition of such images from one picture space to another as such images are enlarged or reduced in size. Tsunoda does not, therefore, provide a motivation for one skilled in

the art to modify Tsunoda's display device with the teachings of Matthews, since Tsunoda does not teach or suggest that the individual images from the video sources may be altered by the user. Furthermore, Tsunoda does not even teach or suggest that supplemental information about a display image may be stored within the system, let alone to display such information upon selection by a user. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's combination of Tsunoda and Matthews is improper, and that independent claim 14 is allowable over such a combination.

Dependant claims 15-18 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claim 14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 103(a) rejection of claims 2-5, 14-18 and 32-34 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-11, 19-28, 36, 37 and 40 as being unpatentable over Tsunoda in view of Matthews and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,838 to Killian ("Killian") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0005453 to Rodriguez ("Rodriguez").

For the same reasons discussed above with respect to the Examiner's § 102(e) rejection, Tsunoda does not teach every element of independent claims 1 and 31. Thus, claims 1 and 31 are believed to be allowable over the combination of Tsunoda, Matthews, Killian and Rodriguez. Accordingly, dependant claims 6-11 and 36, 37 and 40 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 1 and 31, respectively.

With respect to independent claims 14 and 22, for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the Examiner's § 103(a) rejection over Tsunoda in view of Matthews, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's combination of Tsunoda, Matthews, Killian and Rodriguez is improper, and therefore, that claims 14 and 22 are allowable over the combination of these references. Dependant claims 19-21 and 23-28 are thus allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 14 and 22, respectively. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-11, 19-28, 36 37 and 40 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 43 as being unpatentable over Tsunoda in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/830472. However, this references is an unpublished application, and therefore is not prior art. In a telephone conversation, the Examiner stated that

the secondary reference in this rejection is actually International Publication No. WO 00/25267 to Poston (“Poston”). For the same reasons discussed above, Tsunoda does not teach every element of independent claims 1 and 42. Thus, claims 1 and 42 are believed to be allowable over the combination of Tsunoda and Poston. Accordingly, defendant claims 12 and 43 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 1 and 42, respectively. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection of claims 12 and 43 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has not stated a rejection of independent claim 30. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is also allowable over the applied references. Allowance of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s rejections have been overcome, and that the application, including claims 1-43, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejections and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

REEM SAFADI ET AL.

December 29, 2003 By: _____
(Date)

Clark Jabol

CLARK A. JABLON

Registration No. 45,803

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1293

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: cjabol@akingump.com